

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re J.B. et al., Persons Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.E.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E040562

(Super.Ct.No. INJ016804)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Christopher J. Sheldon,
Judge. Affirmed.

Patti L. Dikes, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

No appearance for Minors.

D.E. (mother), the mother of J1, who is presently four years old, and J2, who is presently two years old, appeals from an order of the dependency court terminating her parental rights. The presumed father of the children is not a party to this appeal.

The children were taken into protective custody because mother and the children were homeless. On March 18, 2005, a petition was filed on their behalf pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 300, subdivision (b).¹ It further alleged that: mother had a history of methamphetamine abuse, which affected her ability to parent; there was a history of domestic violence between mother and the presumed father; and mother and the presumed father were homeless and unable to provide necessities for the children.

A jurisdictional/dispositional hearing was held on May 5, 2005. Mother and the presumed father submitted on the petition and reports that were admitted into evidence. The court sustained the petition, declared the two children to be dependents of the court and established a reunification plan. The children were placed with the maternal grandmother who wants to adopt the children.

A six-month review hearing was held on December 5, 2005. (§ 366.21, subd. (e).) Mother had not made herself available for drug testing and had not put forth any effort on her reunification plan. The report prepared for that hearing recommended termination of reunification services and setting a selection and implementation hearing pursuant to section 366.26. Mother was present for the hearing. The court followed the recommendation and terminated reunification services. Mother was orally advised of her

¹ All further statutory references are to this code.

right to seek writ review of the court's orders and findings. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 38.1(a).) Mother did not seek writ review.

The selection and implementation hearing was held on March 30, 2006. Mother was present. No affirmative evidence was presented. Mother submitted on the reports that recommended termination of her and the presumed father's parental rights and adoption as the most appropriate plan for the two children. Mother argued against termination of her rights. The court followed the recommendation. It found adoption to be the permanent plan and terminated parental rights.

Mother appealed and at her request we appointed counsel to represent her. Counsel has filed a brief under authority of *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of facts and requesting this court to conduct an independent review of the entire record.

We provided mother with an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but she has not done so.

We have now completed our independent review and find no arguable issues.

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

/s/ McKinster
J.

We concur:

/s/ Ramirez
P.J.

/s/ Miller
J.